

## REMARKS

In response to the Office Action dated June 14, 2005, please consider the following amendments and remarks made in a good faith attempt to move prosecution of this application forward to a proper allowance of the claims.

Please note that any and all fees associated with this response, including any applicable extension fees under 37 C.F.R. 1.136, and any fees for newly presented claims, may be charged to the deposit account of the undersigned, Account No. **50-0894**.

Applicant here requests such extensions under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 as may be necessary to render this response timely.

### **Claim Rejection; 35 U.S.C. 112(2)**

Claim 1 has been amended in an attempt to address the issues raised by Examiner pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 112(2).

### **Claim Rejections; 35 U.S.C. 102(b)**

Claims1 currently stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by, and/or rendered obvious by Nakao.

It is respectfully urged that Claim 1, as presently amended, is clearly novel, at the very least with respect to the treatment of a synthetic tent, tarp or fabric weather barrier.

### **Claim Rejections; 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Insofar as Claim 1 being alleged obvious in view of Nakao, it is urged that repairing synthetic tents, tarps or fabrics weather barriers, even in the face of compelling need, and

substantial business opportunities in the industry created by such need, escaped all involved in the field.

The U.S. military establishment wasted millions of dollars on previously unrepairable tents, prior to the present inventor's development. In a November 2000 memo, a true and correct copy of which accompanies this response, the U.S. Army was "proud to announce" the availability of the then-new, present method (this was referring to the present inventor's method). The memo, among other things says that **"...sewing is not adequate repair process for polyester materials."**, **"...represents a significant cost savings and quality of life improvement."**

There self-evidently existed a long-felt, but unsatisfied need for the present method. Whatever methods were available in other contexts (including that of Nakao), it was not obvious to those in the relevant art to adapt and utilize same for repairing the items as claimed.

It is respectfully urged that the present rejections be withdrawn, and allowance of Claim 1, as amended, progress at the earliest possible time.